

**REMARKS**

In regard to the Forms PTO-1449 returned by the examiner with references initialed as being considered by the examiner, please note that US 4,806,109 was not initialed as being considered. The examiner is requested to indicated for the file that US 4,806,109 has been considered.

In regard to section 1 of the office action, the application was filed with drawings. A copy of the drawings from the international application were sent to the USPTO by both WIPO and by applicant's attorney when entering the national stage under 35 USC 371. PAIR indicates that the drawings are in the electronic file folder in the USPTO PAIR system. If there is something wrong with the drawings as accepted by WIPO, the examiner is requested to specify the problem with the drawings.

In regard to the objection to the specification, attached is a substitute specification with appropriate line spacing and font. No new matter has been added. The invention is described adequately for the purposes of 35 U.S.C. 112, so no changes have been made to the specification. In regard to 37 C.F.R. 1.77(b), the arrangement of the specification is suggestive; not mandatory.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The examiner is requested to reconsider this rejection. The examiner stated that "Claim 1 is so unclear, how does this device is to operate and what it is intended to accomplish is unclear." Claim 1 clearly states that the claimed invention is an "electric connector". There is no uncertainty regarding



what the device is or what it is intended to accomplish. The examiner stated, "in figures 2, 3, how can signals be transmitted if signal lines are all shorted at part 14?" There is no disclosure in the application that part 14 shorts the signal lines. As would be understood by anyone skilled in the art, the shield 14 does not touch the signal lines. The signal electrical contacts are spaced from the shield 14. The examiner asked "What is the purpose of this feature and what is function of part 14?" As its name clearly instructs the reader, part 14 is a shield. A person skilled in the art knows what a shield is and what its function is. The examiner stated that "Also figures 2, 3 are unclear in that just how the signals above and below part grounds are interconnected is unclear, purpose of contact arrangements below part 14 (figures 2,3) at 15, 16 is unclear." As explained in the application, Fig. 2 shows the rear of the connector shown in Fig. 1, and Fig. 3 is an alternate embodiment of the connector shown in Fig. 2. In the embodiment shown in Fig. 2, the ground contacts 5 at the top level are connected to the shield 14 which is connected to the grounding legs 15, and the ground contacts 5 of the lower level are connected to the grounding legs 9. The signal contacts 6 of the top level pass behind the shield to the signal legs 16 and the signal contacts of the lower level extend down with the signal legs 16. In the embodiment shown in Fig. 3, the ground contacts 5 of both the top level and the bottom level are connected to the shield 14 which is connected to the grounding legs 15. The signal contacts 6 of the top level pass behind the shield to the signal legs 16 and the signal contacts of the lower level extend down with the signal legs 16. This is all shown in the



drawings. A person skilled in the art, reading the specification and looking at the drawings would find the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph clearly fulfilled. The PCT examiner certainly had no difficulty examining the application. The examiner is requested to reconsider his rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

In regard to sections 6 and 7 of the office action, claim 1 has been amended above to clarify applicant's claimed invention. In view of the clarification, the examiner is requested to reconsider his rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The claims were not rejected based upon prior art. Therefore, it is believed that the claims are currently patentable. For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issue remain, the examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.



Appl. No.: 10/532,182  
Reply to Office Action of: 11/28/2006

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Harrington  
Mark F. Harrington (Reg. No. 31,686)

1/30/07  
Date

Customer No.: 29683  
Harrington & Smith, PC  
4 Research Drive  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212  
203-925-9400

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail on the date shown below in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

1-30-07  
Date

Ann Aden Towich  
Name of Person Making Deposit